

Start of new case

Q1 Does the draft guidance cover the relevant issues about the right of access?

☒ Yes

☐ No

☐ Unsure / don't know

If no or unsure/don't know, what other issues would you like to be covered in it?

Q2 Does the draft guidance contain the right level of detail?

☐ Yes

☒ No

☐ Unsure / don't know

If no or unsure/don't know, in what areas should there be more detail within the draft guidance?

There needs to be more detail around subject access requests of CCTV footage

Q3 Does the draft guidance contain enough examples?

☐ Yes

☒ No

☐ Unsure / don't know

If no or unsure/don't know, please provide any examples that think should be included in the draft guidance.

Examples should be provided relating to how the public requests data from; retailers, insurance companies, the police

Q4 We have found that data protection professionals often struggle with applying and defining 'manifestly unfounded or excessive' subject access requests. We would like to include a wide range of examples from a variety of sectors to help you. Please provide some examples of manifestly unfounded and excessive requests below (if applicable).

Manifestly unfound could be an instance where the individual requesting the information is not present, for example, in surveillance footage.

Q5 On a scale of 1-5 how useful is the draft guidance?

1 - Not at all useful	2 – Slightly useful	3 – Moderately useful	4 – Very useful	5 – Extremely useful
<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q6 Why have you given this score?

More examples need to be used with clearer explanations. This is because many organisations are still refusing subject access requests.

Q7 To what extent do you agree that the draft guidance is clear and easy to understand?

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q8 Please provide any further comments or suggestions you may have about the draft guidance.

A lot of jargon is used in the guidance so I would suggest more clear language should be used.

- Q9 Are you answering as:
- ☐ An individual acting in a private capacity (eg someone providing their views as a member of the public)
  - ☒ An individual acting in a professional capacity
  - ☐ On behalf of an organisation
  - ☐ Other

Please specify the name of your organisation:

ocucon

Q10 How did you find out about this survey?

- ☒ ICO Twitter account
- ☐ ICO Facebook account
- ☐ ICO LinkedIn account
- ☐ ICO website
- ☐ ICO newsletter
- ☐ ICO staff member
- ☐ Colleague
- ☐ Personal/work Twitter account
- ☐ Personal/work Facebook account
- ☐ Personal/work LinkedIn account
- ☐ Other

Thank you for taking the time to complete the survey